The Shakespeare Newsletter

Vol. IV, No. 5 *"Knowing I lov'd my books, he furnish'd me . . ."* November, 1954

Midsummer Nights Dream At The Metropolitian

What *Life* magazine called the biggest airlift in theatrical history occured when over ten tons of scenery, 267 pairs of ballet shoes, 12 pairs of wings, etc, were flown to New York City last September for a spectacular musical ballet production of *A Midsummer Night's Dream.* But the combined efforts of Director Michael Benthall of Old Vic, of Choreographer Robert Helpmann, of Musical Director Hugo Rignold of the Liverpool Philharmonic, of Mendelssohn's music, of an ochestra of 60, a ballet corps of 28, and an acting troupe of 60 failed to impress most critics.

The Critics

Although Robert Helpmann, Moira Shearer, and Stanley Holloway as Oberon, Titania, and Bottom were outstanding, Brooks Atkinson of the *NY Times* (Sept. 21) found the production " heavy," and "slow-footed," and the pedantry of the ballets impeding the flow of the story. The whole production was in "the taste of a departed era" with the rustic thespians "respectable business men on a frolic."

Harold Clurman of the *Nation* found the settings"Victorian baroque," the ballets "banal," the direction "uncertain," and the entire production a "huge bore . . . all Hollywood beauty and pretension." Actually the production was commissioned for the Edinburgh Festival in a spectacular production on the condition that Sol Hurok would bring it to the U.S. later.

A *Newsweek* reviewer declared that the production was "condemned by its very size and lumbering generosity," and *Time* magazine found it "neither Shakespearean in essence nor artistic as a whole . . . along with much that is genuinely charming there is much that is unmercifully dull."

The production praised 8 pt. bld..

The Production Praised

Irving Kolodin, writing in *Saturday Review* after most critics had had their say, declared that the critics "who rendered adverse judgment just weren't tuned in" to ballet, tableaux, music, and play as a fanciful unit. He found the production done with "love and understanding and enthusiasm."

The company is now completing a nine week tour of the U.S. and Canada after twenty-nine performances in New York City.

Production costs were so great that the 3800 seat Metropolitan Opera House had to gross $55,000 weekly to cover expenses. Adverse criticism did nothing to box office receipts because practically every seat was sold out in advance.

Max Reinhardt brought a similar musical extravaganza to New York in 1927.

SNL can go on only if you go along with it. Renew and recommend us to your Library, Colleagues, and students. Give *SNL* for Xmas.

Caesar and Merchant Scheduled For Canadian Stratford Festival

Julius Caesar and *The Merchant of Venice* have been announced as the new plays to be produced at the Stratford Shakespearean Festival in Canada in 1955. The popular *Oedipus Rex* of last season will be revived for a limited number of performances.

Michael Langham of London's West End will direct one of the plays and Festival Director Tyrone Guthrie the other. Frederick Valk of the London stage and screen will star as Shylock. Frances Hyland will take the role of Portia. Miss Hyland and several other actors were reengaged after the 1954 season.

A music Festival is planned in conjunction with the 3rd season. It is hoped that the Hart House Orchestra under the direction of Boyd Neel, Director of the Toronto Royal Conservatory of Music, will be as distinctive as the Shakespearean plays. Classic and modern music together with outstanding soloists will be featured.

The present tent theatre has a life span of about four years. A tentative date of 1957 has been set for the permanent theatre with its balcony bringing all spectators close to the stage.

Yale F1 Facsimile Selling Widely; Third Printing a Possibility

Orders coming in at the rate of 200 a day are fast cutting the dwindling supply of the second printing of the Yale University Press First Folio Facsimile. A first printing of 3200 was exhausted before actual publication date and the second issue of 2100 may be gone already. A third printing is a possibility. Only twenty five copies of the two volume interleaved edition were printed.

The Huth Folio from which the reproduction was made ranks among the twenty-five finest in the U. S. and is in a fine state of preservation. It was purchased on Nov. 9, 1911 by Alexander Smith Cochran ('96) for the Elizabethan Club which he founded at Yale and endowed with books. There were forty-two Shakespearean items in the Huth Collection bringing a price of £36,000.

Two Year Project

At the suggestion of Helge Kokeritz, and through the bounty of a New York industrialist who established the Louis M. Rabinowitz Foundation, the project to reproduce the Folio was launched nearly two years ago. The foundation made the $12.50 price possible, a price so reasonable that the volume has been named the "poor man's Folio." Copies of the last reproduction - the Methuen facsimile - have been selling for as high as $100. The economically priced Halliwell-Phillipps reduced facsimile (1887) which is sometimes seen offered at approximately $3.50 has recently been collated by Charlton Hinman and found to be quite unreliable. Cdr. Hinman has shown that Halliwell-Phillipps touched up many of the pages and used two different folios for the reproduction. (Cf *SQ*, V:4 (Autumn '54), 395-401). A recent booksellers catalogue offered complete plays torn from the first Folio at prices ranging from $140 to $196 per play.

Oregon Festival Announces Plans

Five plays instead of the usual four will give the 15th Annual Festival at Ashland, Oregon, next summer unusual interest. In addition to the *Dream, Macbeth, All's Well,* and 3 *HVI,* the rarely staged *Timon of Athens,* will be presented for two performances. If the performance proves popular, a rarely performed play will be included in all subsequent programs.

Although income from the 1954 season was above that of previous years, a deficit of almost $1000 resulted because of weather conditions and large expenditures on improved seating. Additional seating improvements and repair of the stage foundation are contemplated. In order to meet increasing costs, ticket prices will be scaled from $2.40 to $1.20. Previously all seats were reserved at $1.80.

Festival founder and Producing Director Angus L. Bowner is currently on sabbatical leave from Southern Oregon College. He is engaged in post-graduate work at Stanford University where he is writing a doctoral dissertation on the Oregon Festival.

Castellani's Romeo & Juliet Wins Film Award

The joint British and Italian entry of Renato Castellani's film version of *Romeo and Juliet* won the 15th Annual Film Festival Award at Venice last September. The young director adapted and personally supervised the entire production, adding and cutting as he pleased.

Two years were required to make the technicolor film. Although the modern additions stand out from Shakespeare's language, yet the critics were apparently not too much disturbed; some found the production "beautiful and engaging" and others "exciting to watch and glowing with a truly Italian richness of texture." Philip Hope-Wallace writing in *The Manchester Guardian Weekly* finds most faults "due to not trusting Shakespeare the dramatist to know best."

The glowing color of the scenes, the "thrilling cinema" of Mercutio's death, the superb acting of Flora Robson as the Nurse, and "the absence of the 'arty' touches of Hollywood ostentation," says the English critic, "are far more important to stress than the rewriting of Shakespeare's play." But publicity gives Shakespeare no credit anyway, so it is Castellani's "version" throughout.

Besides the frequent and disconcerting cutting, the plague in Mantua is over-emphasized, the apothecary is eliminated, Romeo dies of stabbing not poison, and Castellani constantly intrudes to take over the telling of the story. Susan Shentall and Laurence Harvey are little praised for their part in the film. Sir John Gielgud speaks the Prologue and is the best speaker in the play.

Castellani has presented "a pathetic legend nobly staged among the lovliest buildings in the world."

SHAKESPEAREAN PAPERS AT NY MLA

"Hamlet as Scourge and Minister," Fredson Bowers, Virginia.

"Shakespeare's Rituals and the Opening of *King Lear,*" William Frost, Univ. of California (Santa Barbara).

"Cymbeline and the Woman Falsely Accused," Homer D. Swander, Wisconsin.

"Chekhov's *Seagull* and Shakespeare's *Hamlet,*" Thomas G. Winner, Duke

Season's Greetings
The Editor

Shakespeare-Sibelius TEMPEST Produced In Cincinnati

A novel production of *The Tempest* revived from the Antioch College Shakespeare Festival with most of its original cast was presented in Cincinnati on December 3 and 4. The performance was accompanied by the 68 piece Cincinnati Symphony Orchestra headed by Dr. Thor Johnson conducting the American premiere of Jean Sibelius's score for the *Tempest.* The 30 voice Cincinnati Music and Drama Guild chorus and its soloists assisted the actors who spoke the Shakespearean lines.

An original setting designed by Frederick Kiester of the Julliard School of Music surrounded the orchestra integrally envisioned "as the sea o'er which the tempest rages." Basil Langton was in charge of the production which was staged in honor of Sibelius's 89th birthday on Dec. 8th.

SNL GREETS THE MLA AT NEW YORK

The Shakespeare Newsletter
Published at Pembroke, North Carolina
Editor & Publisher
LOUIS MARDER
Department of English
PEMBROKE STATE COLLEGE
Pembroke, North Carolina
Six issues annually—Feb., April, May, Sept., Nov., Dec.—Annual Subscription $1.00
Entered as Second Class Matter at the Post Office, Pembroke, North Carolina
Vol. IV, No. 5 Nov., 1954

A Shakespeare Boom

Last September, Washington, D. C. correspondent Holmes Alexander was writing a column on Shakespeare and asked us whether there was any evidence that a Shakespeare boom was in progress. Naturally we had much to say.

Undoubtedly, there have been booms in the past, but this in no way detracts from the current rise in interest in Shakespeare. We say "rise" because Shakespeare is continuously popular. Shakespeare is always and all ways interesting.

The evidence for this is not hard to find. From statistics we have on hand we note that the seasons total at Stratford-upon-Avon is still close to a third of a million. On this side of the Atlantic we had approximately 125,000 playgoers at Stratford, Canada; over 37,000 at Antioch in Yellow Springs; about 18,500 at Ashland, Oregon; about 16,000 at San Diego, California, and we know not how many at the many other Festivals, summer performances, travelling companies such as the Barter Theatre and Old Vic Company both here and abroad. etc. Our own incomplete survey, for the summer only, indicated forty-four productions of twenty-one plays with Shaw running second with thirty-one productions of fifteen plays. Virtually every play of Shakespeare's was acted last year according to Dr. Mary Hyde's annual tabulation in the *Shakespeare Quarterly*.

Attendance figures prove something and nothing. They do not compare with almost 900 performances of *The Seven Year Itch* nor with the almost 700 of *Can-Can*. Figures cannot reveal the true zeal of the bardolator, the numbers who see whole series of plays and travel hundreds of miles to see Festival offerings despite the fact that sex and spectacle are not the chief interest factor. And how many more would see the plays if productions were conveniently available?

Reasons for the Boom

The reasons for the current boom are not difficult to find. Essentially it stems from the fact that Shakespeare is studied in survey and elective courses in virtually every school and college in the English speaking world. Because live productions are either not always available or not frequent enough, stimulating or unsatisfactory, the effect is the same. A desire to see any play, see more plays, see better plays, or see different actors or interpretations, is developed. The enthusiast goes to every production; the more casual admirer goes to learn more. Culture is a hidden hunger easily satisfied by Shakespeare.

Furthermore, the principles of Elizabethan staging have become more widely known and taught leading to an acceptance of them by many directors and actors anxious to use the new medium, or rather, the old medium, with increased understanding. Once faith in the principle was established, it became necessary to find places for such staging. With "open staging" being more economical than conventional staging, it was comparatively simple for enterprising groups to organize companies and to set up stages which soon had national recognition.

With broadened facilities added to the existing but latent desire for Shakespeare, success was a foregone conclusion. Thus plans for new Festivals are being promulgated to meet the existing demand in other localities.

The more Shakespeare, the finer will the critical taste of the audience become. The Companies will rise to meet the new standards. The future can only be bright.

Shakespeare Via The Stage

In the past issues, we have aired opinions on the teaching problem as they revolved around some of the features and facts of Bradleian character analysis. In this issue we present another approach that has been gaining momentum along with Shakespeare productions so economically staged in the Elizabethan manner.

With the widespread burgeoning of the Shakespeare Festival - none of them behind the proscenium - thousands of students are seeing their first Shakespearan play done on the stage. Not the least of its advantages is the concentration on the lines permitted by the absence of disconcerting scenery. The imagination can still be used. Concentration is on plot, character, and the beauty and rhythm of Shakespeare's poetry - when the actors have mastered it.

This new interest in the presented play is generating greater emphasis on the living play in the classroom. Teaching, many of us feel, should not be based solely on expounding the plays as classic footnoted literature, as dramatic poetry, as character studies, as Freytag formulae, symbols, or as conflicts to be resolved, but as dynamic performances representing living characters by living actors on a credible stage. We do not mean to make acting projects of class work, or actors of our students. What we mean to emphasize is the reality of the play as a living entity rather than as a subject from which to study aspects of life, psychology, language, history, morality, etc. That Hotspur's age is changed, that there are three different ghosts in Hamlet, that there is "double time" in the plays, etc., are interesting to know and discuss, but "the play's the thing." On the boards, most of these problems are non existent.

We certainly ought not bury the play under footnotes until it has been given a chance to come to life. Our task is to make it live. When this is done, then it is wise to go back and show how much more there is to Shakespeare when a deeper insight into the language and content is attempted. For the teacher who has embalmed the living Shakespeare, we point out that the day of ressurection is at hand. We are all called; we are all chosen.

Shakespeare Workshop

Louis A. Haselmayer, Iowa Weslyean College

[A contribution to *SNL's* series on the teaching of Shakespeare]

A Shakespeare Workshop designed especially to stimulate high school teaching of Shakespeare's plays was held at Iowa Wesleyan College, Mt. Pleasant, Iowa on Saturday, October 23 under the auspices of the Department of English. Seventy-two high school teachers from southeastern Iowa attended the one day conferenece as guests of the college.

The Workshop was planned and the lectures given by the writer, whose ultimate aim was to place an emphasis on Shakespearean drama as part of the living theatre— drama to be performed rather than drama to be read. Teachers were urged to use every technique to keep alive in the student mind that the Shakespearean text is a play, not merely *dramatic poetry*.

Understand Elizabethan Staging

The workshop consisted of two sessions. The first was concerned with Elizabethan staging and stressed the difference between Elizabethan and modern staging. The Elizabethan stage was discussed under its three characteristics: an *open platform* without scenery, an *extended apron*, and a *multiple acting area*. The *open platform* required an emphasis upon the hearing of the lines for plot exposition, characterization, and communication of essential information. The *extended apron* stage conditioned the presentational acting of a character of Shakespearean comedy and farce-burlesque and made reasonable the use of the aside and the sililoquy for the revelation of character. The *multiple acting areas* resulted in a rapidity and fluidity of action and plot. The influence of this stage setting can be traced in the dramatic techniques of the plays. It resulted in a different type of theatrical illusion than exists in the modern theatre.

These basic dramatic principles are obscurred in any attempt to stage Shakespeare with realistic scenery and lighting on a modern proscenium arch stage. Our very classroom interpretation of the plays is usually made in terms of modern, not Elizabethan staging. Slides illustrating Dr. J. C. Adams' reconstruction of the Globe Theatre were used. The points were emphasized visually through the demonstration film prepared by William and Mildred Jordan, "Shakespeare's Playhouse, 'The Globe.'"

An account was given of modern attempts to stage Shakespeare in the Elizabethan manner. Two chief methods were analyzed. The first is through a reconstruction of the Globe Theater as it is done in some university and college theaters, particularly at Hofstra College, the University of Illinois, and the State University of Iowa. The technical problems and the purely academic aspects of this method were considered. The second method is the adaptation of the principles of Elizabethan staging used at the Canadian Stratford and Antioch College Summer Festivals. Photographs of both of these stages were shown, as well as a varied collection of action shots from the 1953 and 1954 productions at both festivals. This method was stressed as usable in any community or school and was felt to be well established in usage.

Audio-Visual Aids Valuable

The second session was devoted to the use of audio-visual aids in teaching. These aids are supplements to, and not substitutes for, teaching. They require careful preparation and careful follow-up. They should never be used without careful advance study by the instructor. The general recommendation was that at the present time recordings are more useful than films. They are more easily available, less expensive, more professional in quality. Teachers were urged to make their own record collections.

A comprehensive checklist of available films, film strips, tape recordings, and records was distributed, and the items evaluated. Consideration was given to the three excellent commercial films, not available on 16mm for school use, the Sir Lawrence Olivier productions of *Henry V* and *Hamlet*, and the M.G.M. *Julius Caesar*.

By way of illustration, attention was concentrated on *Julius Caesar*, a standard high school choice of reading. Sections of the recording of the sound track of the M.G.M. production were played. Frames from the available film strip of this production were shown. The entire Avon Production film of *Julius Caesar*, directed by David Bradley and starring Charlton Heston, was presented.

Following the formal sessions, teachers were able to examine an exhibition of recordings, film strips, and photographic stills.

Discussions, private conversations, and resultant correspondance have revealed that those present were convinced that Shakespeare's plays *must be taught as living theater*, that a grasp of Elizabethan staging is essential to an understanding of the plays, and that the careful use of audio-visual aids is helpful for this general purpose.

Bloody Murder

Sing a song of Seneca--
Everyone must die:
Chiron and Demetrius
Baked in a pie;
Lavinia had her tongue cut out,
So she couldn't sing;
Chiron cut his hand off
And sent it to the King.

N. B. Allen-University of Delaware

Dissertation Digest

COMPLETED DISSERTATIONS

Edited by
Neille Shoemaker, Baldwin-Wallace College

Soviet Shakespeare Appreciation (1917-1952), Edgar Harold Lehrman, Columbia University, 1954, pp. 465.

The gist of this thesis is that there is great emphasis on Shakespeare in the Russia of the Communists. This is true both in the number of publications devoted to Shakespeare and in the staging of his plays. The second important fact of the thesis is that the Shakespeare enthusiasm has gone through several cycles. The 1920's constituted a period of great innovation in Shakespearean performances. In the 1930's there was great emphasis placed on Shakespeare's Humanism. There was more interest in his political characters and ideas. He more and more became associated with the great masses. He was the great poet of the Proletariat. During this period the quailty of Shakespearean criticism improved. The leading director of Shakespeare performances was Sergei Radlov. By 1939 Shakespeare had reached the place in Russia where he was entitled to a special celebration. In connection with the celebration, an annual Shakespeare conference was begun.

During World War II Shakespearean criticism became propaganda for the government. It was used to help morale and to unite Russia with her Western allies. This continued until 1947 when the Shakespeare criticism became officially hostile toward the West. By 1952 Shakespeare was caught in the vise of Russian censorship and there were tight controls on what was written about him.

Preaching in Elizabethan and Jacobean Drama, Alberta E. Lee, Columbia University, 1953, pp. 341.

It was Dr. Lee's opinion that the church and the theater were not antagonistic to each other and indeed used many of the same materials and devices. Many of the playwrights engaged in preaching, in drama rather than from the pulpit. This was natural since the Renaissance believed that poetry should not only please but should instruct. The author shows that the preachers very often "staged" their sermons and used theatrical devices. She made an analysis of sermonic subjects to show that they were frequently used in the theater, such subjects as sin, mercy, vanity, and rebellion. Some of the preachers studied were Jewel, Sandys, Becon, Smith, and Latimer. There are short sermons in many Elizabethan plays, as for example the sermon on drunkenness in *Hamlet*. Vices were used by both preacher and playwright. The latter used their sinful characters both for dramatic interest and as a lesson in the ways of morality.

Anima and Affectus: Theories of the Emotions in 16th Century Grammar Schools and their Reflections in the Works of Shakespeare, Rolf Hans Soellner, University of Illinois, 1953.

The Elizabethan concept of the emotions is that they eminate from the soul. This theory was taught in the curriculum of the grammar school. This thesis deals with the psychological information which the students could have derived from the schools. There is no proof that Shakespeare derived his knowledge of the emotions from his grammar school but the conclusion is that the school could have furnished him with ideas on the soul and the relation of the emotions to it. There was of course no class devoted to the subject but it was presented by the faculty from the authors whom the students read. Both the grammars and the dictionaries contained moral teachings. Shakespeare could have derived information on the emotions from the Christian poets read in the school. He could have been familiar with Terrence and his use of emotions in drama. The curriculum taught the best of moral philosophy and knowledge of the soul.

DISSERTATIONS & WORKS IN PROGRESS

Edited by
William White, Wayne University

SHAKESPEARE'S PROBLEM PLAYS, Ernest Schanzer, University of Liverpool.

This thesis is concerned with an examination of those of Shakespeare's plays in which a moral problem occupies a central position. The discussion centres on *Measure for Measure* and *Julius Ceasar*, but also deals with *King John*, the *Henry IV* and *Henry V* trilogy, and *Cleopatra*.

SHAKESPEARE'S NARRATIVE TECHNIQUE: A STUDY IN THE CHANGES OF FORM AND FUNCTION OF THE NARRATIVE ELEMENTS IN HIS PLAYS, Kurt Schluter, University of Munich.

The art of the dramatist consists of his skill in telling his story through dialogue. The dissertation traces the steps that show how Shakespeare acquired this skill. Certain conventional types of dramatic-narratives are singled out to demonstrate the changes in diction and in scenic representation. Thus new light is shed on the structure of individual scenes and on Shakespeare's methods of handling established conventions.

DAS LYRISCHE IN SHAKESPEARE'S DRAMEN, Wolfgang Schomburg, University of Kiel.

The songs, the short lines, and those pentametre passages which are to be regarded as lyrical ones, have been interpreted, and, within the three groups, classified according to their lyrical intensity, which results from many little lyrical peculiarities. All those peculiarities have been put together as the essence of Shakespeare's lyrics within the drama.

JAMES JOYCE'S USE OF SHAKESPEARE IN *ULYSSES*, William M. Schutte (Carnegie Institute of Technology), Yale.

A detailed analysis of Joyce's use in *Ulysses* of Shakespeare's works, Shakespeare biography and Shakespeare criticism is followed by a study of how the Shakespeare materials contribute to the reader's understanding of what Joyce has to say about modern civilization and about its effect on the development of the individual.

THE DRAMATIC FUNCTION OF THE SONGS IN SHAKESPEARE'S PLAYS: A VARIORUM EDITION, Peter J. Seng (Northwestern University), Harvard.

The dissertation treats, in standard variorum fashion, substantially all the songs and song fragments in the Shakespeare canon. Textual variants are given from all the 16th and 17th century editions, and from 19 important modern editions from 1709 until the present. In addition, relevant quotations or summaries of criticism are given from the modern editions and from numerous other Shakespearean critiques. Finally, appendices are added treating as fully as possible the dramatic functions of the songs, sources and analogues, and the "original" or earliest version of the music of the songs.

LOVE PATTERNS IN SHAKESPEARE'S PLAYS, Janet South, Columbia University.

A historical study of love mores and their literary expression, with emphasis on the Hibernian Arabs of the 11th century, the troubadours of Provence, and the three great writers of 14th century Italy; a comparison of these with Shakespeare's conception of love, particularly as it is revealed by his use of source materials.

CONTEMPORARY ALLUSION IN SHAKESPEARE'S COMEDIES, Roy F. Montgomery, University of Tennessee.

This study attempts a comprehensive synthesis and analysis of contemporary allusions in the comedies from *Comedy of Errors* to *Twelfth Night*.

The time–1600-01

The scene – Command performance at Whitehall of a new play by William Shakespeare

The occasion–At this feast of the Epiphany Queen Elizabeth has ordered special entertainment for her guest, Don Virginio Orsino, Duke of Bracciano

Dr. Leslie Hotson's

THE FIRST NIGHT OF TWELFTH NIGHT

Here is the first performance of *Twelfth Night*–the preparation, the setting, the royal reception, reconstructed from new and contemporary evidence by one of the world's foremost literary detectives.

Dr. Hotson leads the reader through the royal requisition of *Twelfth Night*, contemporary reports, and the Duke's letters to his wife describing the occasion —

- presenting a revolutionary conception of the Shakespearean stage
- pin-pointing hitherto obscure references in the play to the Queen, her court, the occasion
- recreating all the excitement and behind-the-scenes preparation of the first performance

A Brilliant Moment in the HISTORY OF THE THEATER

Winner of the 1953 Modern Language Association-Macmillan Award given for the book "which through sound research contributes significantly to a general understanding of English or American Literature."

256 pages $4.50
8 illustrations

The Macmillan Company
60 FIFTH AVENUE, NEW YORK 11, N.Y.

Shakespeare On TV

MAURICE EVANS AND RICHARD II

Roland Mushat Frye, Emory University

Maurice Evans' beautiful TV "Hallmark Hall of Fame" production of *Richard II* is now available for schools and colleges as a free-loan 16mm sound film, obtainable through the Institute of Visual Training, 40 East 49th St., N. Y. Billed as the first major live TV presentation to be made available for educational distribution, the film is conveniently divided into three reels running forty minutes each. Much red tape had to be cut, certain acting rights waived, and considerable expense borne by the sponsor, Hallmark Cards, in order to provide this valuable service. For all this, the Hallmark Company is to be commended, and it is surely to be hoped that other commercial sponsors will follow this fine example.

Evans' production satisfies the highest standards of acting, staging, and photography. The advantages of the film media are skillfully and faithfully exploited, even to small details. The costumes and settings are impressive and even beautiful, and technique is subordinate to art throughout. The film convincingly brings the viewer into the very presence of the action by dextrous handling of movement and sound.

As for the acting, the supporting roles are, in general, competently and convincingly treated—especially the parts of Bolingbroke and of Gaunt. The Bishop of Carlisle sometimes seems too startlingly patterned on Bishop Sheen, and Miss Churchill's final bursting of a blood vessel in the parting scene is scarcely effective, but these are, after all, small matters. Evans himself, of course, *is* Richard II to a generation of Shakespeareans, and there is no need to say more than that he acts the effete yet strangely growing king in his own best manner.

Flaw in Production

Indeed, there is but one major flaw to Mr. Evans' performance, and this is in his role as producer. It is surely justifiable to cut and rearrange a play, as Evans frequently does here, in order to present it effectively. But there are limits, which Evans has violated flagrantly and in the most highhanded fashion. He has deliberately inserted into Shakespeare's play some 20 lines from Marlowe's *Edward II* (Brooke's edition, lines 2356 - 78) so as to convert Shakepeare's subtly drawn Bolingbroke into an unequivocal villain after the Marlovian pattern. The "Have I no friend . . ." lines from Shakespeare are not reported by Exton (V,4) but spoken by Bolingbroke, as is "I would thou wert the man . . .", after which point Bolingbroke is made to usurp the lines of Marlowe's famous "lawne thrust through the throte" lines, and the destruction of Shakespeare's finely ambiguous Bolingbroke is complete. The subtle mixture of good, evil, and unknown is flattened out into a merely melodramatic villain. By any accepted standard of fidelity, this is stretching too far the privilege of adaptation. Evans is primarily at fault, but the sponsor too should be concerned over such bastardizing, and the instructor who uses this otherwise brilliant film for his classes should be careful to point out what has happened here.

Shakespeare's Popularity

The popularity of the Shakespeare country as a mecca for tourists is revealed by the latest statistics. The Birthplace was visited by 180,302 as compared with 179,752 last year. Ann Hathaway's Cottage was visited by 155,435, over 5000 more than the previous record. Other places of interest showed slight declines in attendance. New Place was visited by 30,857 (34,875), Mary Ardens house by 21,363 (25,054), and Hall's Croft by 26,914 (33,814). Among the 88,504 who signed their names in the Visitors' Book at the Birthplace were representatives of eighty-eight nations. Over 20,000 of the signers came from the United States.

FEARS OF ARREARS?
WHY NOT RENEW NOW
Facilitate Bookkeeping by Sending
At Least $2.00
We'll add the years to current expiration date.
P.S. Drop us a card if no longer interested.

CURRENT BIBLIOGRAPHY

The Yale Shakespeare: TWELFTH NIGHT, ed. by William P. Holden, pp. 144; AS YOU LIKE IT, ed. by S. C. Burchell, pp. 121; MACBETH, ed. by Eugene M. Waith, pp. 138; THE TAMING OF THE SHREW, ed. by Thomas G. Bergin, pp. 125; ROMEO AND JULIET, ed. by Richard Hosley, pp. 174; MEASURE FOR MEASURE, ed. by Davis Harding, pp. 131; Yale University Press, 1954, $1.50 each.

The publication of the Yale Shakespeare as revised by the faculty and former students of Yale under the general editorship of Helge Kokeritz and Charles T. Prouty is the largest undertaking of its kind in the U. S. in recent years. It coincides with the publication of the revised volumes of the Arden Shakespeare currently being distributed in the U. S. by the Harvard University Press. The Yale Shakespeare is a handy pocket-sized book (6⅞ x 4⅝), adequately glossed at the foot of each page, and conveniently numbered at every five lines of large type. Supplementary notes are at the end of the text. In addition to these there are three appendices to each volume giving information on the text, date, and sources, and providing a brief but suggestive modern bibliography.

Consideration of the edition calls for more space than is at our disposal here. Briefly though, we may say that it is obviously the aim of the general editors to turn away from the so-called German scholarship which produced texts with elaborate introductions, copious and heavy footnotes illustrating every line and explaining every possible word, and a score of appendices. This type of text is often filled with the emendations, lucubrations, and additions of *all* the previous editors, gives the source of sources, provides a thesaurus of parallel references from classic and contemporary literature, indicates scene localities, and provides stage directions. The text is illustrated by thousands of lines of commentary. Nothing is left to the imagination of the reader. We recall that it was George Steevens who wrote in the 18th century-even then-that Shakespeare was being elucidated into obscurity.

The purpose of the Yale Shakespeare is to give us a text in a version as close to the original as possible. Some necessary information is given in brackets but all indication of the scene of action is removed. The general editors also tell us that much of the original punctuation, capitalization, spelling (where it is useful), and lineation have been maintained. Whether there is any virtue in restoration one way or the other depends somewhat on taste. Hosley, at least, prints the nurse's lines in 1.3 of *R & J* as prose following Q3 and F1, but he prints Mercutio's Queen Mab speech as verse following the *Bad* Q1 and disregarding Q2, Q3, and F1. Apparently some "taste" is used.

That the Yale Shakespeare gives us a worthwhile text, and that it provides more opportunity for teacher and student contribution in imagination and scholarship is admissable. Yet it might be that aside from the virtue of the mental discipline that close reading gives, the imagination and the "scholarship" of the student and teacher may very well lead *to those very emendations* which the editors have so studiously sought to eliminate. Shakespeare is hardly a poem that "should not mean but be." The beauty of Shakespeare's poetry might be better appreciated without the distraction of footnotes, but yet the 350 year gap must be bridged by sound scholarship or else the unwary may be bogged down with a few yet unchronicled types of ambiguity.

The success of Shakespeare on the stage may be offered as proof that footnotes are unnecessary. But every student of the Bard knows how much may be missed by mere observation of the acted play. The Yale Shakespeare is a good guide because it gives glossarial notes that are adequate and some supplementary notes that are descriptive, critical, and dramatic. For close study, however, the new Arden, Variorum, and Cambridge editions will be valuable supplements.

MR. WILLIAM SHAKESPEARE'S COMEDIES, HISTORIES, & TRAGEDIES, A facsimile edition prepared by Helge Kokeritz with an Introduction by Charles Tyler Prouty, New Haven, Yale University Press, 1954, pp. xxix, $1250.

Publication of the Yale University Press F1 facsimile is the latest in a series of publications and activities which is making Yale University a notable center of Shakespearean activity in the United States.

The present undertaking was made possible through the Louis M. Rabinowitz Foundation, but the excellent reception of the volume has insured the success of the venture and a second printing is under way.

This handsome 9 x 11¼" volume is bound in light cocoa buckram with a red spine label printed in gold. The opaque paper is of fine quality. Side margins are a liberal two inches for annotation. Although the editors consider it a virtue to have reduced the original F1 page size by approximately one-fifth for ease of handling, for our part we had rather have had the volume two inches taller along with the satisfaction of knowing it was an exact full-scale reproduction of the original.

Professor Kokeritz' brief *Preface* tells us that the excellent Huth copy in the Elizabethan Club at Yale was used for the reproduction and that no tampering with the text has been attempted. It is Professor Kokeritz, too, who has put the act, scene, and line indications at the foot of each page to facilitate comparative reading from standard texts.

An informative twenty-three page *Introduction* is supplied by Professor Charles Tyler Prouty whose scholarship in bibliographical matters is here a valuable asset. After briefly making some comments on the preservation, popularity, and prices of F1, Dr. Prouty launches into a discussion of the kind of copy that was furnished to the printer. For our better understanding of the problem, he supplies the reader with an analytical survey of "theatrical customs and the physical business of printing," based primarily on Henslowe's practices in relation to the provenance and treatment of the text. From the number of lost plays - 623 are extant from a possible total of 5000 - he draws the sometimes-heard conclusion that Shakespeare probably wrote more plays than we have. Another conclusion which he believes allows "no other alternative" declares that "Shakespeare probably worked with other playwrights in his company." The disintegrators will probably take comfort in the remark and distort it out of all proportion. Such conclusions might be avoided by not attributing Henslowe's practices to the Chamberlain's men, and by assuming - it need hardly be an assumption - that Shakespeare had sufficient talent to work alone. What Shakespeare did for others is not here our concern, but for the plays in F1 we have the word of Heminge and Condell. Dr. Prouty considers the various kinds of copy from the point of view of original manuscript, bookkeeper's additions, changes made during rehearsal, alterations made for the revels office, reported texts, actors' parts, etc., illustrating some of these factors in the cursory treatment given the *Much Ado* folio copy. The essay concludes with remarks on Elizabethan printing in general and the Folio in particular. Here the Yale professor follows E. E. Willoughby's still standard *Printing of the First Folio of Shakespeare* (1932), and the dissertation of one of his students Dr. John Shroeder who was made some significant contributions to the subject. An article on the Folio by Dr. Shroeder will appear in *SNL* in the near future.

Free Plug for the Arden Shakespeare

Christian Kiefer of the University of Arizona sent in a clipping from the student newspaper, *The Wildcat*, describing what he called an unexpurgated performance of *Twelfth Night*. From the clipping we quote: "The script used will be the ardent edition and nothing will be cut."

Essays In Honor of Yale's First Folio Facsimile

Editing the First Folio

When ir 1623 John Heminge and Henrie Condell offered us Shakespeare's plays "cur'd, and perfect of their limbs; and all the rest, absolute in their numbers," their hope was "without ambition either of selfe-profit, or fame: only to keepe the memory of so worthy a Friend, & Fellow alive as was our SHAKESPEARE." To them we are indebted eternally for one of the most precious books in the world. Because of its effect on the minds, hearts, and literatures of England and the world, we must agree with Sir Sidney Lee who called the 1623 Folio the most significant of all secular books in the English language.

For eighteen plays (*Temp, TGofV, M for M,* CofE, AYLI,*Shrew,* AWEW, TN, WT, KJ, *IHIV,HVIII, Corio, TofA, JC, Mac, A&C,* and *Cymb*) F1 is our only source, and for four plays (2 and 3 *HVI, HV,* and *MWW*). it gives a superior text to that of the earlier variant quartos.

Heminge and Condell had been associates of Shakespeare's for at least twenty-two years when he left these "fellowes xxvis. viiid. A peece to buy them Ringes." Though scholars have doubted their assertion that the copy they sent the printer was as perfect as they claimed, and that they had "scarce received from him [Shakespeare] a blot in his papers," yet it was they who are the authority for Shakespeare's authorship of the plays in the volume, it was they who supplied whatever text - whether marked Quarto, playhouse copy, or assembled text - the printer used, they who supplied the list of actors, they who followed the pattern of Ben Jonson's 1616 Folio and divided most of the plays into acts and scenes, (which none of the eighteen previously printed Quartos had), they who edited and perhaps supplied stage directions, they who procured the frontispiece, and accompanying verses, they who secured the commendatory poems, dedicatees, and wrote the Address to the Readers (although some think that Ben Jonson wrote it for them). They divided the *Shrew, IHVI,* and *Hamlet* imperfectly; *CofE, Much Ado, LLL, MND, MofV, AWEW, HV Corio, TA,* and *JC* they divided into acts only; 2 and 3 *HVI, T&C, R&J, Tof A,* and *A&C* are undivided, and the remaining sixteen plays are tuny divided.

These loyal friends probably decided on publication after Pavier and Jaggard had started printing their "false folio" in 1619. It was William Jaggard, now old and blind, and his son Isaac to whom they entrusted, probably in 1621, the printing of their colleague's plays. The venture was an expensive one and Ed. Blount a publisher was called into the venture and also I. Smithweeke and W. Aspley. Blount's name appears on the title page with Jaggard's (Isaac, William had died), and the other names appear in the colophon, but here "W" is substituted for Isaac. The final volume of 454 leaves (908 peges) measuring about 8½ x 13½ must have appeared shortly after Nov. 8, 1623 when most of the unpublished plays were registered. On Feb. 17, 1624, the Bodleian Library sent its copy to the binder.

Printing Difficulties

The printing had entailed some difficulties. There seems to have been trouble registering *T&C* and when finally successful, they inserted it, upaged except for two misnumbered pages, at the beginning of the tragedies after being originally scheduled to follow *R&J.* There seems to have been trouble with *WT,* perhaps because the copy was mislaid. It is strange, too, that *TnC* was included with the tragedies, but so is *Cymb.* It is also possible that three volumes were intended because the sections are separately numbered.

Difficulties with the "copy" and the human factor produced literally thousands of errors, typographical and otherwise. Estimates of 3500 recognizable errors and 2000 minor ones have been made. Yet the Baconians find it a carefully printed book in order to defend their ciphers. Black and Shaaber's study noted that 3373 "deliberate changes" were made in the three succeeding folios of which 1129 are accepted by most modern editors.

Approximately 1000 copies were printed and sold at £1 a volume, an expensive volume for those days of 6*d.* books. The price of the book was, however, fortunate because the volume was so treasured that about 240 of them are still preserved today. The recent high prices - up to $100,000 for a perfect copy - are attributed not to their numerical scarcity, but to their desirability and the scarcity of perfect copies of which only fourteen are known to exist.

Heminge and Condell's editorial efforts were well received. Four subsequent editions were called for in the next seventy years, and in 1709 Shakespeare attained the stature of a classic by being edited in 6 volumes by Nicholas Rowe, first of a line of thousands of editions.

But interest in the scholarly editions has not detracted from interest in the Folio itself. Facsimile Folios have been published since the advent of photographic methods. The first of these was produced by "the newly-discovered process of photo-lithography with R. W. Preston and Howard Staunton overseeing the production (Day and Son, 1866). It was issued serially in sixteen parts. This edition was later republished with debasing changes (Cf, *SQ.,* V:4 (Fall '54), in reduced size in one volume with an introduction by James O. Halliwell-Phillipps in 1876 (Chatto and Windus). An American edition of it was done by Funk & Wagnalls in New York in 1887. Sidney Lee supervised a facsimile of the Chatsworth copy (Clarendon Press, 1902) in two volumes, and the famed Methuen facsimile was made in 1910. The Yale venture is the latest to supply the ever growing needs of the Shakespeare world.

HARPER & BROTHERS PUBLISHERS ANNOUNCE THE PUBLICATION OF A DISTINGUISHED COLLECTION OF ALL OF SHAKESPEARE'S WORKS IN ONE HANDSOME VOLUME

WILLIAM SHAKESPEARE

The Complete Works

Edited by Charles Jasper Sisson

Assistant Director and Senior Fellow, The Shakespeare Institute Stratford-on-Avon

1430 pages, 6 1-4" x 10"
Text Edition $4.50

HARPER & BROTHERS
49 East 33rd St., New York 16, N. Y.

Variant Readings in First Folios

Charlton Hinman

The Folger Shakespeare Library in Washington contains 79 copies of the First Folio—by much the largest collection in the world. These copies are now being systematically collated throughout; i.e., they are being subjected to a very detailed word-for-word and even letter-for-letter comparison.

The purpose of this labor is to discover the variant readings in what remains our basic textual authority of more than half of Shakespeare's plays. It has recently been demonstrated beyond doubt that no two copies of the First Folio can be presumed to be identical. Changes were made in the text—changes sometimes fairly extensive, sometimes very important even though quantitatively small—during the course of the printing, and different copies therefore show different readings. The methods of proof-reading and press-correction which produced these variant readings, moreover, were in some ways so unsystematic that individual copies of the finished book seemed never to have contained the same mixtures of "uncorrected" and "corrected" states.

The only thing that is predictable appears to be irregularity; and hence the only way of finding all of the first Folio's variant readings is to collate a large number of copies from beginning to end.

This huge task, which involves the very careful examination of some 75000 large, double-columned folio pages, is now well under way. In fact the project has been brought about half way to completion and, with the continued aid of my collating machine. I hope to finish it in approximately another year of full-time work.

The "Hinman collating machine" was devised and perfected over a period of several years between the end of World War II and early 1953, when work on the Folger Folios was begun. It makes collation possible at something like 40 times greater speed, and yet also with much greater accuracy, than heretofore. By means of a complex of mirrors and positioning mechanisms it permits, first of all, the superimposition of the images of corresponding pages, both illuminated, of the two copies being compared. Then, as the operator looks at these superimposed images through a binocular telescope, it illuminates the two pages alternately. The result is that any difference between the two pages immediately calls attention to itself by violent motion, as first one and then the other reading appears at the point of difference. Even very small variations thus betray themselves; and the whole process, for a given pair of pages, may require less than two minutes.

Although a precision instrument, and so expensive to build that few researchers are likely to be able to have one for individual use, various institutions will eventually acquire one—as the Houghton Library at Harvard, and certain others, have already done. Originally developed for the sole purpose of making the collation of the Folger Folios practicable, it has proved to have various other uses as an accurate, high-speed comparision device. Prints (engravings, etchings, and the like) have been found suitable grist for it no less than books. And of course there are other works than those of Shakespeare that were subject to stop-press-correction during printing and may contain variants of great significance to textual scholars.

Hundreds of Variants Found

It would be imprudent, at present, to attempt an estimate of precisely to what extent the variant readings now being discovered may alter our traditional views about the reliability and authority of the First Folio text. Hundreds of variants have already been found, however, and more are sure to be turned up. Thus there seems no doubt but that the completed record of them will throw a great deal of light on the early history of Shakespeare's text—and of Shakespeare's text at the most important stage when the manuscript versions of his plays, long since irretrievably lost, were first being trasmuted into the printed versions that are now our only substantive witnesses of what he actually wrote.

The project will do less toward establishing a truly definitive text of Shakespeare than to demonstrate the impossibility of our ever achieving such a text. We can expect from it, however, a definitive *First Folio text* and, concomitantly, a very much clearer understanding of both the authority and the limitations of the celebrated edition of 1623.

..Dr. Charlton Hinman was teaching English Drama at Johns Hopkins when recalled into the Navy at the outbreak of the Korean war. Since 1953 Cdr. Hinman has been working at the Folger. He is currently a Guggenheim Research Fellow.

The Itinerant Scholar

At the 4th annual South Central Renaissance Conference, Tulane University, November 3-4

PROOF AND PROBABILITY IN SHAKESPEARE SCHOLARSHIP AND CRITICISM

Hardin Craig, University of Missouri

There are two major principles, both derived from the best current science and philosophy, that have important bearings on the study of Shakespeare. The first of these applies primarily to scholarship. It used to be that scholars and scientists sought perdurable principles and absolute truth. In these days the scientists at least have learned modesty and caution. They no longer regard so-called scientific principles as unshakable laws or creeds, but merely as hypotheses marking the advance of science and mainly useful as guides to further investigation. Literary scholarship, however, seems to adhere to the outmoded practice of the scientists of earlier generations. When hypotheses that seem to explain certain perplexities are announced, they are often immediately accepted as laws and are generalized over areas to which they do not apply. This is illustrated from speculative solutions of the problem of the "bad" quartos. Stenographic reproduction, the "pirate actor" theory, and that of "memorial reconstruction" may with care be rendered probable in certain cases but they do not establish universal laws, for there were other conditions not yet considered, such as the textual degeneration produced by continual revivals and performances of plays by inferior troupes, thought of usually as traveling players.

The second principle has reference mainly to interpretation or criticism. The age-long quarrel between mysticism and science or between intuition or revelation, on the one side, and reason or common sense, on the other, always a hindrance to intellectual progress, has been restudied and a sort of nexus between these conflicting theories has been most plausibly advanced. It consists in an explanation of the mystery of cognition (and therefore creative imagination) in terms unintelligible to minds formed in a three-dimensional world. It is said that the act of cognition occurs in the fourth dimension when a three-dimensional space-time continuum meets in the brain with a one-dimensional continuum or sequence. The necessary inference is that intuition is not a separate intellectual function but merely a natural part of an act of intellection. There is in the light of this theory no longer a reason why critics and interpreters should think of their insight as a supernatural thing rather than as the evidence of superior minds. It lays upon them, however, the necessity of being reasonable as well as perspicacious. The effect of this unitary concept would be to produce scholars of greater insight and interpreters with more common sense.

PREPARING A VARIORUM EDITION

Matthew W. Black, Univ. of Pennsylvania

The ideal of a Variorum edition is to find and set forth all the material upon which an eclectic text may safely be based. This is, of course, a counsel of perfection which it can hardly fulfill in practice, since even by the time it is printed new techniques for the establishment of copy-text, new facts concerning variants in the folios and other important editions, and new views of the whole textual problem may have been promulgated and make necessary some modifications of its findings. But allowing for this time-lag, it should be possible for editor A to take a Variorum volume and from it reconstruct a text which seems to him as near as possible to what the author wrote, while editor B, with a different set of principles and a different interpretation of the facts, but with the same end in view, is making a very different text.

The task of the Variorum editor is to get all the facts. His method of displaying them should be as simple as the facts will allow. Ordinarily he will begin by reproducing as exactly as possible in modern type the most authoritative early text. He will then collate this with all other early texts and with the many later editions in which a serious effort has been made to arrive at what the author wrote. He will digest this collation for the guidance of editor and critical reader. Finally he will set forth, so far as space permits, every known shade of opinion on the history and state of the text and on every disputed reading, including his own opinion when, owing to the thoroughness of his investigation, his opinion becomes itself a relevant fact.

THE YOUTHFUL SHAKESPEARE

Robert Adger Law, University of Texas

During the past two years writers of three well advertised books have attempted to solve the problem of the youthful Shakespeare, what he was doing in preparation for his career as poet and dramatist in the period roughly covered by the years 1580 to 1590 or a bit after. The late Albert Feuillerat in *The Composition of Shakespeare's Plays* pictures him busily revising a half-dozen plays now attributed to him, and often revising again in such fashion that statistical analysis of the verses will show which lines he borrowed intact, which he amended, and which he added of his own. In *The Annotator* Keen and Lubbock convince themselves not only that the youth wrote four hundred marginal notes in an extent copy of *Halle's Chronicle*, but that he was brought up a papist and probably left Stratford with his Roman Catholic teacher for priestly training in Douai, and that he later changed his mind and returned to England to live with a Roman Catholic family in Lancashire as an actor until he went down to London. E. B. Averitt in *The Young Shakespeare* vigorously argues that the dramatist's first profession was that of a "noverint," or law clerk in London, and that he began early to compose and copy down certain writings, most of which still survive though never before recognized as Shakespeare's. Evidently, these three theories are mutually contradictory. Though the argument for each one proceeds logically if certain premises are granted, all are purely speculative and appear to be wide of the truth.

ADVERSITY AND THE MIRACLE OF LOVE IN KING LEAR

Paul N. Siegal, Ripon College

The significance of the doctrine concerning adversity's blessings of the sixteenth-century moral treatises and books of consolation has not been fully realized. Adversity, these works stated, by teaching the instability of earthly things enables men not completely lost to evil to be governed by the love of God and to grow in charity.

In *King Lear* adversity is a purgatory that burns away the selfishness of the good, bringing them the miracle of love, a heightening of their humanity. Gloucseter comes to see what the uncertain world, whose ways he has followed, is and to love humanity more than himself. He dies in an ecstacy on hearing Edgar's account of his pilgrimage, for his own and his son's sufferings have become meaningful by their reunion in a love which has brought them closer together than ever before.

So too Lear finds in Cordelia the perfect pattern of love, which he learns to follow. Redeemed for heaven, he dies in the ecstatic belief that Cordelia is alive. Perceptive Elizabethans would have found in this a deep significance: Lear's belief might be regarded as the mysterious insight believed to be granted a man on the point of death. The heaven that he had seen would be his and Cordelia's in prison, while ironically false as a picture of what awaited them there, was thus given an aspect of prophetic vision.

At the South Atlantic Modern Language Association, Columbia, S. C., November 26, 1954:

KING HAMLET'S AMBIGUOUS GHOST

Robert H. West, Univ. of Georgia

Scholars have recently tried again to decide for certain whether King Hamlet's ghost comes from the Catholic purgatory or from some paganesque one. They can make no sounder case for either than may also be made that the ghost is really a masquerading devil. Apparently Shakespeare has deliberately mixed the pneumatological evidence, for such mixing is usual in his treatment of the supernatural. Whether the witches in *Macbeth* are truly witches or are devils or Norns or whatever is impossible to say surely, and Ariel is a highly ambiguous figure pneumatologically. One reason Shakespeare had for not conforming the ghost to a recognizable pneumatology is, perhaps, that he wanted it to have maximum dramatic impact and knew that to fit it to a theory or a convention would "devitalize" it. As several scholars have noticed, the ghost of King Hamlet is a genuinely contemporary specter. Another reason Shakespeare may have had is his practice of maintaining a philosophic reserve about great mysteries. He is more likely to duplicate the perplexities of life itself than the comparatively thin solutions of speculative thinkers. The critic may, of course, have an opinion about the nature of the ghost, just as he might have one about a ghost in real life. But to try to establish it out of the pneumatological evidence that Shakespeare leaves us is hopeless and fruitless.

SHAKESPEARE'S ATTITUDE TOWARD TRAVEL

Denver E. Baughan, Univ. of Florida

Shakespeare's earliest plays indicate that on the subject of travel he was influenced by the courtesy-books and young gallants about town to accept the conventional notion that travel was indispensable to the well-rounded gentleman. As a matter of fact, specific passages in *The Two Gentlemen of Verona* read like *The courtier* in little, and nowhere is travel disparaged. Later the young man from Stratford seems to have realized that traveling by the books and boasting of it as the young gallants often did were all a fool's paradise. Hence Shakespeare's maturer emphasis on travel has to do not so much with the distance the traveler has gone as with the living he has put into the going. This way round a Gloucester may remember the taste of the Bishop of Ely's strawberries; a Falstaff may babble of the chimes at midnight at Clement's Inn; a King Duncan may revel in the enchantment of Macbeth's Castle; or an Antony may wander through the streets with his Cleopatra "and note the qualities of people."

Courtship in Shakespeare

By WILLIAM G. MEADER

Mr. Meader defines the varieties of courtly love and traces their development in literature and society from the time of Eleanor, showing the state of the tradition as it was received by the 16th century. He examines the exhortations of the preachers and the English laws relating to spousals and shows how these factors are fused with the tradition in Shakespearean drama generally. He examines in detail *Troilus and Cressida* and *Measure for Measure*, showing how his discoveries can explain certain ambiguities in these and other plays.

$4.00

Columbia University Press . New York 27

REVIEW of PERIODICALS

THE UPSTART CROW

Attempts by Dover Wilson and others to posit the existence of several lost source-plays, as material later merely revised or reordered by Shakespeare, are unconvincing, argues E. A. J. HONIGMANN, of Stratford-upon-Avon. The revival of the series of hypotheses by which Malone and others tried to show that the "non-scholarly" poet borrowed nearly all of the learning in his plays from earlier plays, relies far too heavily upon the acceptance of Malone's or a later still doubtful chronology. But theories about the poet's learning and his work as an adapter, still inconclusive, must partly determine the chronology, not vice versa. Since the "upstart crow" in Greene's famous attack refers, as we know from other uses of this comparison, more to Shakepeare's borrowing of *sententiae* and examples than to more important borrowings, acts and scenes in which echoes of Shakespeare's contemporaries appear can be better attributed to his imitating of others than to the authors of now "lost" plays. Shakespeare may have been the author of the *Hamlet* of 1589 mentioned by Nashe. *The Shrew* is based more upon the *Supposes* than a possible earlier *Shrew*, a Shakespearean *Richard III* may have been in existence by 1591, and a *King John* by 1590/91. ["Shakespeare's Lost Source-Plays," *Modern Language Review*, XLIX:3 (July 1954), 293-307.]

HAUNTS OF WINTER

C. Overbury Fox suggests a printer's error in the following passage from 2 *Henry IV*. IV, 4. 91-93:

O Westmoreland, thou art a summer bird
Which ever in the haunch of winter sings
The lifting up of day.

Furness and the O. E. D. explain *haunch* as " the hinder part, the latter end." Mr. Fox feels that the poet Shakespeare would have been unlikely to use *haunch* in this context ("a word suggesting meat") and proposes *haunts* or *haunt* as an emendation. ["The 'Haunch' of Winter," *Notes and Queries*, New Series I:1 (Jan. 1954), 21.]

A SHAKESPEAREAN IMAGE-CLUSTER?

After citing E. A. Armstrong's *Shakespeare's Imagination* (1946) and its analysis of image-clusters in Shakespeare's plays, Professor Kenneth Muir of the University of Liverpool points out an image-cluster in the opening scene of *The Two Noble Kinsmen* and argues that it is an indication that Shakespeare wrote the scene. As Armstrong has shown, Shakespeare always associates the word *kite* with all, or nearly all, of the following images: bed (or sleep), death, spirits, other birds, and food; and Professor Muir has discovered all these images either before or after the reference to a kite in this first scene of *The Two Noble Kinsmen*

["The Kite-Cluster in *"The Two Noble Kinsmen," Notes & Queries*, New Series I:2 (Feb. 1954), 52-53.]

PRESSED TO DEATH

In a solid contribution to *explication de texte*, K. B. DANKS exhibits how Shakespeare turned to dramatic uses his knowledge of the barbarous device of *peine forte dure* (crushing of the naked victim by gradual addition of weights to the point of death) sanctioned by eminent Elizabethan Jurists for punishment of presumed criminals who by declining to plead avoided forfeit of personal possessions to the Crown. Mr. Danks notes that without actually using the term *peine forte et dure* as such, but converting the expression 'crush' to 'press' and its derivatives, Shakespeare assimilates the image to the tragic fabric in *Richard II*, III.iv. 74, *Romeo and Juliet*, I. 1, 182-4, *Othello*, III. iv.163 and *Lear*, IV.iii. 25-6, and to Bawdy and erotic quibbles in innumerable passages, as in the *Troilus*, III.ii.215 and *Measure for Measure*, V.i.516. [Shakespeare and 'Peine Forte et Dure,' " *Notes and Queries*, n.s.I:9 (September 1954), 377-379.]

MARLOWE MONOMANIA

An enlarged version of the Calvin Hoffman thesis that Christopher Marlowe is the author of Shakespeare's plays (Cf. *SNL*: II:8:44). is presented by Robert L. Heilbroner in a creditable if not credible manner. For eighteen years Mr. Hoffman has pursued the quest to prove that Marlowe's "mighty line" and the "soaring words" of Shakespeare were produced by the same pen. Disclaiming the remark that most heresies are "the product of so many disordered or publicity-seeking minds," the author shows that skepticism is rampant, that Shakespeare could not have had the learning or vocabulary, that he had no access to court and learned circles, no access to scarce books, that the author definitely travelled in Italy, that Shakespeare was only an actor, that most accounts of the Bard are apocryphal, that no one else could have written the plays because only Marlowe had the style, etc.

After Marlowe's "death", Frizer and Poley were reemployed by Thomas Walsingham, "Marlowe's friend and patron." *"Probably"* a wretch's body was substituted for Marlowe's; the coroner was *"undoubtedly* bribed." Frizer *" was provided* with an excuse," the Marlowe murder *"trumped up,"* a corpse *"hustled to an unknown grave,"* and Marlowe - still alive - spirited away to later write in "awful danger of exposure . . . for complicity in murder as well as for atheism . . . condemned to eternal anonymity." [Italics ours.]

Because of the "vacuum of facts" concerning Shakespeare, his authorship is an "hypothesis" rather than an established fact. *Venus and Adonis*, registered six weeks before Marlowe's death is Marlowe's, Walsingham providing a scrivener to copy Marlow's originals before sending them to Shakespeare who was merely a literary fence. As proof, we have a scrivener mentioned in Walsingham's will, - a scrivener so skilled that he wrote his copies perfectly and "never blotted out a line" to which Jonson testifies! The W. H. of Sonnet fame is none other than Walsingham!

The reason for the "staying" of *As You Like It* in 1600 is its quotation from Marlowe by himself; William is here portrayed as a simpleton; Mar-text is "Marlowe's text."

Touchstone's remark "it strikes a man more dead that a great reckoning in a little room" an allusion to Marlowe's supposed death in a little room. After some additional parallels from the *Sonnets* - and how else can a parallel originate except from a man quoting himself - the Shakespeare scholars "who probably are apoplectic by now" are asked to disregard Miss Spurgeon's evidence that Shakespeare's and Marlowe's imagery were different; Marlowe obviously was maturing. When in Sonnets 37 and 89 Shakespeare speaks of his "lameness," Hoffman mentions a possibility that Marlowe was lame because J. P. Collier says Marlowe once fell from the stage and broke his leg.

Final proof is offered in Dr. T. C. Mendenhall's analysis of word-lengths as evidence of authorship. Bacon didn't correspond with Shakespeare's practice but Marlowe did - and this was pointed out in 1901. Hoffman prays for a "single fact which would controvert my thesis" but finds nothing. He has even identified a portrait that must be Marlowe and looks like Shakespeare. His great hope is to find the manuscripts buried in Sir Thomas Walsingham's tomb in Scadbury Chapel. The canon there forbids opening the tomb, but the local townspeople are hoping for a business boom, and are exerting pressure. The latest word is that "The canon is weakening."

["The Murder of the Man who was William Shakespeare, *Esquire*, XLII:6 (Dec. 1954), pp. 115-122.]

STATEMENT REQUIRED BY THE ACT OF AUGUST 24, 1912, AS AMENDED BY THE ACTS OF MARCH 3, 1933, AND JULY 2, 1946 (Title 39, United States Code, Section 233) SHOWING THE OWNERSHIP, MANAGEMENT, AND CIRCULATION OF The Shakespeare Newsletter published six times pr year, Feb., Apr., May, Sept., Nov., Dec., at Pembroke, N. C. for October 1, 1954.

1. The names and addresses of the publisher editor, managing editor, and business managers are:
Publisher—Louis Marder, Pembroke State College, Pembroke, N. C.
Editor—Louis Marder, Same.
Managing editor—Louis Marder, Same
Business manager—Louis Marder, Same

2.The owner is: (If owned by a corporation, its name and address must be stated and also immediately thereunder the name and address of stockholders owning or holding 1 percent or more of total amount of stock. If not owned by a corporation, the names and addresses of the individual owners must be given. If owned by a partnership or other unincorporated firm, its name and address, as well as that of each individual member, must be given.) Louis Marder, Pembroke, N. C.

3. The known bondholders, mortgagees, and other security holders owning or holding 1 percent or more of total amount of bonds, mortgages or other securities are: (If there are none, so state.) None

4. Paragraphs 2 and 3 include, in cases where the stockholder or security holder appears upon the books of the company as trustee or in any other fiduciary relation, the name of the person or corporation for whom such trustee is acting; also the statements in the two paragraphs show the affiant's full knowledge and belief as to the circumstances and conditions under which stockholders and security holders who do not appear upon the books of the company as trustees, hold stock and securities in a capacity other than of a bona fide owner.

5. The average number of copies of each issue of this publication sold or distributed, through the mails or otherwise, to paid subscribers during the 12 months preceding the dates shown above was: (This information is required from daily, weekly, semiweekly, and triweekly newspapers only.)

LOUIS MARDER
OWNER

Sworn and subscribed before me this 1st day of December, 1954.

James A. Jacobs
(My commission expires August 5, 1955.)

"While memory holds a seat in this distracted globe," you can enjoy this brilliant reconstruction of Shakespeare's Theatre

THE GLOBE RESTORED

A study of the Elizabethan Theatre
By C. WALTER HODGES

This handsomely illustrated inquiry into the physical features of Shakespeare's theatre offers "an acute visual impression of the Elizabethan theatre and the London in which it flourished," says the *Booklist* of the American Library Association. "Highly recommended," say the *Library Journal*.

62 plates, 8 line drawings from historical sources, and 20 drawings by the author. Cloth, 7½ x 10, xiii plus 199 pages, index. $7.50

At all bookstores or order direct from
COWARD-McCANN, Inc.
210 Madison Ave., New York 16

The Elizabethan Bookseller
Waukegan, Illinois
Monthly Lists of Elizabethan Items

Review of Periodicals

CONTRIBUTING EDITORS
Ned B. Allen, Delaware; Peter Allen, WQXR, N. Y.; F. S. Bromberger, Redlands; R. J. Dorius, Yale; S. F. Johnson, N. Y. U.
John B. Shackford, Cornell College, Bibliographer

DOWN WITH FORMALISTS

Professor Marvin Rosenberg of the University of California refuses to accept the theory that Elizabethan actors used formalized gestures and were "human marionettes." The "formalist" theory he attacks was expressed by Alfred Harbage in 1939, was supported by M. C. Bradbrook and others, and culminated in a book by B. L. Joseph, *Elizabethan Acting*, which appeared in 1951. The formalists believe that Elizabethan actors did not try to be realistic, but rather "were trained to be graceful, mannered mouthpieces who recited . . . dramatic poetry without letting their personalities or their personal ideas of the part color the performance . . . ." Professor Rosenberg tries to answer each of their arguments: 1. The formalists declare that Elizabethan boy actors could not have given naturalistic performances of the parts of women. Women's parts were often taken, however, by adult male actors who were artists in their own right. 2. In *Richard* III, V. 5. Buckingham sneers at stilted and conventional acting, but this is really an attack on second-rate acting, not on all acting. 3. Miss Bradbrook argues that in Chapman's *Charlemagne* "joy was expressed by cutting capers," and that indicates formalism. We can hardly suppose, however, that all characters expressed joy by cutting capers—particularly Lear when he was reunited with Cordelia. 4. If a play took only two hours, as indicated in "two houres traffic" there was not enough time for realistic acting. say the formalists; but there is no proof that this phrase denoted only 120 minutes acting time. It might indicate two or three hours. 5. The formalists claim that some of the audience in the Globe were too far from the stage to see the actor's faces and therefore could have been affected only by formalized, exaggerated delivery and posture, but the outdoor theatres were comparatively small, and the *farthest* spectators could not have been more than 75 feet from the rear of the stage, 6. Joseph says that bets were made on the skill of rival actors and that this proves that they had a "generally accepted body of rules as to what was a fault." This evidence might as well be taken to indicate that acting was individual and naturalistic. 7. Actors, say the formalists, were occasionally likened to orators, and orators used stereotyped techniques; but there was no evidence of stereotyped training of actors. 8. The formalists insists that references to "natural" acting by Elizabethans does not mean naturalistic acting; but they depend on "subjective interpretation," and miss the point of Hamlet's criticism of actors who "imitate nature so abominably" and of Heywood's reference to "lively and spirited action" on the stage. Professor Rosenberg observes that Harbage has in some measure deserted the formalist camp in recent years. He then cites Falstaff's mocking of formalized acting in *I Henry IV* and the burlesque of such acting in the part of Pistol. "We and the Elizabethans," he says, "both laugh at Pistol [and the characters he was aping]; they imitated nature so abominably. Back of the formalist attitude, Professer Rosenberg believes, is " a wishful preconception that Shakespeare must be fixed and immutable, never subject to the varying interpretations of mercurial actors." ["Elizabethan Actors: Men or Marionettes?" *PMLA*, LXIX:4 (September 1954), 915-927.]

WHY MELANCHOLY?

The melancholy which Antonio expresses in the opening lines of *The Merchant of Venice*, say the "New Cambridge" editors and Sir Edmund Chambers, results from his fear that he will lose his friend Bassanio when Bassanio marries. Mr. K. B. Danks, however, observes that Antonio makes the speech before he has learned of Bassanio's amorous interest in Portia. A better explantation for Antonio's melancholy is the unaccountable dejection which often foreshadows peril. This is consistent with many other similar situations in Shakespeare, for example, Hamlet's ill feeling about his heart just before his bout with Laertes. ["The Case of Antonio's Melancholy," *Notes and Queries*, New Series I:3 (March 1954), 111.]

WARREN D. SMITH of the University of Rhode Island disagrees with the suppositions that Shakespeare wrote the five prologues and epilogues for *Henry V*, as they appear in the first Folio, for a public theatre performance in the spring and summer of 1599. He demonstrates (1) that the lines given to the Chorus in the 1623 Folio were added some time after the play had been written, possibly after the publication of the 1600 Quarto which omitted them; (2) that the allusion in the Prologue to Act five is not to Essex but to Charles Blount, Lord Mountjoy who was successful over Tyron in the Irish rebellion of 1603; (3) that the choruses were composed especially for a private performance at Court, and (4) were written quite probably by someone other than Shakespeare. The language and theatre involved were not Shakespeare's. "I suspect," he concludes. "that the choruses, replete with fawning utterances so foreign to Shakespeare, were especially designed for a performance before a sophisticated audience which may have included the Queen herself in the small theatre in Whitehall, the Cock-Pit alluded to in the opening prologue as incapable of holding 'the vasty fields of France'." ["The *Henry V* Choruses in the First Folio" *JEGP*, LIV:1 (January 1954), 38-57.

THE CRAIG SHAKESPEARE

21 - Play Edition

by Hardin Craig

. . . contains Shakespeare's twenty-one principal plays plus a full discussion of the life and times of Shakespeare.

1200 PAGES $5.50 LIST

SCOTT, FORESMAN AND COMPANY

CHICAGO ATLANTA DALLAS
NEW YORK SAN FRANCISCO

TRIBUNES OR SENATORS?

Our only authority for the list of dramatis personae in *Julius Caesar* is that first compiled by Rowe and later emended by Theobald. Modern editors have passively followed Rowe and Theobald in calling Flavius and Marullus "tribunes," but Mr. Howard Parsons thinks they should be called "senators." By saying to the workingmen, "Assemble all the people of *your* sort," Flavius shows that he is not one of them (a plebeian), but a patrician. ["Shakespeare's 'Julius Caesar'--Dramatis Personae," *Notes and Queries*, New Series I:3 (March 1954); 113.]

TARLTON AND FALSTAFF

Professor Joseph Allen Bryant, Jr. of Vanderbilt University believes that Dick Tarlton, the famous clown in Shakespeare's company, may have been in part responsible for Shakespeare's creation of Falstaff. Irritated by Tarlton's speaking more than was set down for him and thus interfering with the progress of the play in which he was acting, Shakespeare countered with Falstaff, who was not a mere clown. He was, in fact, an important character. Tarlton had died, but Shakespeare wanted to prevent Will Kemp from stealing the center of the stage as Tarlton had; so he made Falstaff imitate all the devices of the famous Tarlton. Tarlton had been known for his extemporal wit, for his poking fun at religious extremists, for his carousing in taverns with women of ill repute, and for his reluctance to pay bills. Moreover, he died of the plague. In all these things Falstaff is made to resemble him. Professor Bryant observes, too, that Queen Elizabeth's known liking for Tarlton may explain her legendary request that Shakespeare write more about Falstaff in *The Merry Wives of Windsor*. He finally suggests that Will Kemp's departure from Shakespeare's company (ca. 1599) could have been caused by the writing of *The Merry Wives*. Having in two plays played Falstaff, a part which left him little room for extemporizing, Kemp may have "rebelled at being asked to restrict himself a third time." Professor Bryant admits that the parts Kemp played are not certain, and presents this explanation as a mere possibility. By creating Falstaff, then, Shakespeare seems to have put an end to the traditional clown with his right to improvise. When Hamlet first warned the players against allowing such liberties Shakespeare may already have won his fight. ["Shakespeare's Falstaff and the Mantle of Dick Tarlton," *Studies in Philology* LI:2 (April, 1954). 149-162.]

CAESAR'S REVENGE AND JULIUS CAESAR

ERNEST SCHANZER finds a neglected sources of *Julius Caesar* in *Caesar's Revenge*, an anonymous play in the Kyd tradition, probably written in the 1590's though not published until 1606. Among a long list of remarkable similarities, he selects three as especially significant: "The thrasonical traits in Caesar's character, the hubristic tragedy of his fall, and the revenge of his ghost on the field of Philippi." ["A Neglected Source of 'Julius Caesar,' " *Notes and Queries*, N. S. 1:15 (May 1954); 196-7.

DATING HENRY IV

1 *Henry IV* can be dated shortly after *Richard II* in 1595, and 2 *Henry IV* during the winter of 1595-6, writes J. W. DRAPER, of West Virginia University. *Richard II* can hardly have been composed after Hoby's invitation of Cecil to a performance of *King Richard* in December, 1595, nor 2 *Henry IV* after the death of Lord Cobham in March, 1596, for the changes from "Oldcastle" to "Falstaff" must have been submitted to censorship before this date. The lines at the end of Part 2—"Not Amurath an Amurath succeeds, / But Harry Harry"— must have been written before February, 1596, for not until that date did the news reach London that Sultan Murad (Amurath) III was not, contrary to expectation, succeeded upon his death by another Amurath, but by Mohammed III. ["The Date of *Henry IV*," *Neophilologus*, (Jan. 1954), 41-4.]